

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. The Examiner rejected claims 192-222. Specifically, claims 192-195, 197, 199, 200, 203, 208-212, 217, 218, and 220 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Davis; claim 219 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of May; claims 213-215 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Wohl; claims 201 and 204 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Parvulescu; claims 202, 205, and 216 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Owen; claims 206, 207, 221, and 222 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of DeLuigi; claim 198 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Baehr; and claim 196 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis in view of Hotto.

The claims require, among other things, receiving caller identification information at the telephone answering apparatus, transmitting the caller identification information from the telephone answering device to the paging network, and transmitting the caller identification information from the paging network to the portable communication device. Davis certainly receives caller identification information at his telephone answering device, but, contrary to the claimed invention, Davis never forwards the caller identification information to a paging network. Instead, Davis only uses the caller identification information locally at the telephone answering apparatus in order to provide caller-specific processing (e.g., lock out the call, play a message and end the call, play a message and record a message, transfer the call, connect the call to a personal computer, selectively forward messages to a pager, all based on the caller identification information).

The passage of Davis cited by the Examiner as teaching the claimed forwarding of caller identification information from the telephone answering apparatus to the paging network, specifically column 10, lines 1-20, merely states that the telephone answering device is capable of interfacing to a paging terminal through a 1 telephone line interface allowing messages to be relayed to the paging terminal or a 2 telephone line interface allowing connection of the message source with the paging terminal, such that "the

operational sequence of either is dependent upon the source of the telephone call

(emphasis added). Thus, Davis **forwards telephone messages, not the caller identification information itself**, based on the caller identification information. It is clear that Davis does not forward the caller identification information to the paging network, but merely transfers telephone messages to the paging network (see, for example, Davis Summary of the Invention, "it is an object of the present invention to provide for a system and method of selectively **forwarding telephone messages** to paging receivers, **the selection being based upon the ANI signal** and made by a telephone answering device" (emphasis added) and also Davis Column 11, lines 1- 23, " ... messages received by telephone answering machine 410 will not be directed to paging receiver 420 if the calling telephone number does not correspond to those of a predetermined origin as shown in FIG. 4C." Generally speaking, the telephone messages that are forwarded to the paging network will have been entered by the caller using the telephone keypad (see Davis Column 1, lines 31-36, "Other telephone answering devices use a prerecorded voice message to request the caller to enter data over the telephone by using a 12-button keypad. This data is then stored and forwarded to a paging type transmitter and ultimately received and displayed by a paging receiver"). Davis goes on to say that "[n]one of these answering machines has been capable of selectively operating on a message based on the source of the call, with the source of the call being determined by an ANI signal generated by the telephone network. Although some answering devices are capable of selectively performing operations, they do so only at the prompt of the caller. Thus, the caller must enter additional information to identify himself or the steps he desires the answering device to perform. In this implementation, it is the caller who controls the operation of the answering device. The prior art shows no solution for executing a variety of predetermined operation based on the source of the call without caller intervention."

Nowhere does Davis teach or otherwise suggest forwarding the caller identifying information to the paging network (or to any other entity, for that matter). Furthermore, Davis would have no reason to contemplate such forwarding, since his patent focuses exclusively on the caller-specific processing performed locally by the telephone answering device. Thus, Davis actually teaches away from the claimed invention by

receiving caller identification information and using it for just about anything **EXCEPT** forwarding it.

Because Davis does not teach forwarding of caller identification information from the telephone answering device to the paging network, the claims are allowable over Davis both alone and in combination with the other cited references.

2. Applicant respectfully requests that the new docket number reflected above be used on all future correspondence.
3. All pending claims are believed to be in a form suitable for allowance. Therefore, the application is believed to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests early allowance of the application. The Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned, Jeffrey T. Klayman, if it will assist further examination of this application.
4. Applicants do not believe any extension of time is required for timely consideration of this response. In the event that an extension has been overlooked, this conditional petition of extension is hereby submitted, and Applicants request that deposit account number 19-4972 be charged for any fees that may be required for the timely consideration of this application.

Date: May 2, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey T. Klayman
Registration No. 39,250
Attorney for Applicants

Bromberg & Sunstein LLP
125 Summer Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-1618
Tel: (617) 443-9292
Fax: (617) 443-0004

03052/00119 489937.1